

**REMARKS/DISCUSSION:**

This Amendment B is being filed in conjunction with an RCE within three months after the shortened statutory period for response that ended on June 23, 2006. Accordingly, a Petition for a Three-Month Extension of Time is attached hereto.

By this Amendment B, claims 1-14 remain pending in this application. Claim 1 is amended in accordance with the subject matter disclosed in Fig. 3b.

Applicant has carefully studied the outstanding Office Action. This Amendment is intended to be fully responsive to all points of rejection raised by the Examiner and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1, 5, 6 and 10-14 stand rejected as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,897,569 to Kellogg et al. ("Kellogg") as noted in the Office Action.

Applicants respectfully transverse the Examiner's rejection of Claims 1, 5, 6 and 10-14 over Kellogg because, according to Applicants' understanding, the Kellogg reference neither teaches nor suggests the elements of the Applicant's invention. It is Applicant's understanding that a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. See for example MPEP 2131.

Under MPEP 2131, a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim, and the elements must be arranged as required by the claim. Under this standard, Applicant submits that Kellogg fails to anticipate, at a minimum, independent claim 1. Kellogg

does not disclose a current and voltage feedback loop from the output of a transformer, which provides energy to the transducer.

Therefore, Kellogg does not anticipate claim 1 or claims 5, 6, and 10-14 based on their dependency to claim 1.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 2-4 stand rejected as being unpatentable over Kellogg in view of US Patent No. 6,066,135 to Honda. Claims 2-4 depend upon claim 1, and based on the previous discussions, neither Kellogg nor Honda, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest the claimed invention. Reconsideration is requested.

Beyond the foregoing shortcomings with respect to the rejections of claim 1, Applicants further note that the dependent claims include additional limitations not taught or suggested in the art of record, thus forming independent basis for novelty and non-obviousness.

[REMAINDER OF PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]

### **Conclusion**

Applicants submit that in view of the discussion, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103 have been overcome and that the invention is now patentable over the cited prior. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider all rejections and pass this case to issue.

Should any minor points remain prior to issuance of a Notice of Allowance, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees, which may be required to Account No. 10-0750/END-0691/VEK.

Respectfully submitted,

/Verne E. Kreger, Jr., Reg. #35231/  
Verne E. Kreger, Jr.

Verne E. Kreger, Jr.  
Attorney for the Applicant(s)  
Reg. No. 35,231

Johnson & Johnson  
One Johnson & Johnson Plaza  
New Brunswick, NJ 08933-7003  
513 337-3295  
DATED: July 12, 2007